

THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA



CLARK KERR
President of the University

BERKELEY 4, CALIFORNIA

February 15, 1965

Mrs. Daniel N. Hoffman
1029 LaSalle Drive
Sunnyvale, California 94087

Dear Mrs. Hoffman:

Thank you for your forbearance in writing to me first about Mr. Henry Anderson's allegations. The facts in the matter are as follows.

Mr. Anderson was employed by the University of California from 1954 to 1956 as a teaching associate in medical care administration. Following completion of his work for the degree of Master of Public Health, he was re-employed as a graduate assistant research sociologist through 1959, specifically to work on a study of "The Bracero Program in California: With Particular Reference to Health Status, Attitudes and Practices." The study was principally supported by a National Institute of Health grant to the University's School of Public Health with the understanding that it be conducted under the direction of Dr. Edward S. Rogers, Professor of Public Health and Medical Administration, and an interdisciplinary faculty advisory committee.

While it is true that Mr. Anderson's field study was somewhat curtailed, it was not because of any pressure upon the University, but solely because the facilities of the California Department of Employment and the U. S. Department of Labor, upon which he was dependent for his interviews of bracero immigrants, were denied him by these agencies. Although he had not completed the number of interviews he had planned to conduct, in the opinion of Dr. Rogers and the advisory committee he had completed enough to make up a representative sample, and he was instructed to complete his study based on this representative sample.

Upon completion of the study, Mr. Anderson submitted a preliminary report to Dr. Rogers and the committee. Dr. Rogers and the committee were agreed that the preliminary report contained a considerable section devoted to Mr. Anderson's observations and opinions on the political and economic power structure involved in the bracero program. This material was not relevant to the basic study, especially

Mrs. Daniel M. Hoffman
February 15, 1965
Page 2

in terms of the NIH grant. It was also a subject matter area which Dr. Rogers and the advisory committee felt to be quite outside the competence of the field of public health. Mr. Anderson was advised that if he wished to pursue this aspect of his material as a separate publication, he was at liberty to do so. However, if he wished to do this under University auspices he should affiliate his effort with competent sources of advice from more appropriate departments of the University. After appropriate revision to bring the report into its proper focus on health attitudes, problems and programs, the report was published, with Mr. Anderson's concurrence and assistance, by the School of Public Health. A copy of this report will be sent you if you wish it.

Some confusion arose in this matter from the fact that Mr. Anderson, on his own initiative and without foreknowledge of either Dr. Rogers or the advisory committee, had prepared 100 mimeographed copies of his preliminary report in a form that could be interpreted as having received the approval of both, when such was not the case. In view of this fact, Dr. Rogers requested Mr. Anderson to recover approximately 15 copies, after they had been reviewed by the persons to whom Mr. Anderson had sent them, and to return to Dr. Rogers all but a few copies which Mr. Anderson was permitted to retain for his own use.

I understand that Mr. Anderson's preliminary report has recently been published by the Citizens For Farm Labor, P. O. Box 117, Berkeley, California, and may be purchased from that organization for \$3.95. A copy is also available for inspection in the Berkeley campus library.

You may also be interested to learn that Mr. Anderson's allegations have already reached Governor Brown and the San Francisco press.

Sincerely yours,

Clark Kerr